

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO  
GOOGLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE  
NUMBER 3 REGARDING 104  
DOCUMENTS THAT GOOGLE  
CLAIMS ARE IRRELEVANT**

**Redacted Version of  
Document Sought to be Sealed**

**BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**

David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)  
 333 Main Street  
 Armonk, NY 10504  
 Tel: (914) 749-8200  
 dboies@bsfllp.com

Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165  
 Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027  
 44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 Tel.: (415) 293-6800  
 mmao@bsfllp.com  
 brichardson@bsfllp.com

James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)  
 Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)  
 100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor  
 Miami, FL 33131  
 Tel.: (305) 539-8400  
 jlee@bsfllp.com  
 rbaeza@bsfllp.com

Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334  
 M. Logan Wright, CA Bar No. 349004  
 725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor  
 Los Angeles, CA 90017  
 Tel.: (213) 629-9040  
 alanderson@bsfllp.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,  
 JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER CASTILLO,  
 and MONIQUE TRUJILLO individually and on  
 behalf of all other similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

**SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**

Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice)  
 Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice)  
 Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice)  
 Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice)  
 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
 New York, NY 10019  
 Tel.: (212) 336-8330  
 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
 srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com

Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891  
 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 Tel.: (310) 789-3100  
 abonn@susmangodfrey.com

**MORGAN & MORGAN**

John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice)  
 Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice)  
 201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
 Tampa, FL 33602  
 Tel.: (813) 223-5505  
 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
 rmcgee@forthepeople.com

Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805  
 711 Van Ness Ave, Suite 500  
 San Francisco, CA 94102  
 Tel: (415) 358-6913  
 mram@forthepeople.com

Case No.: 4:20-cv-03664-YGR-SVK

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO  
 GOOGLE'S MOTION *IN LIMINE*  
 NUMBER 3 REGARDING 104  
 DOCUMENTS THAT GOOGLE  
 CLAIMS ARE IRRELEVANT**

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers  
 Date: November 15, 2023  
 Time: 9:00 a.m.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Google's MIL 3 is three motions packaged up as one, with Google seeking to exclude 104 exhibits placed into three broad buckets. Google's brief only discusses 16 of those 104 exhibits, and Plaintiffs below address those 16 exhibits and some others included in Google's appendices. Plaintiffs are willing to submit additional briefing on the many other exhibits if permitted to do so. Alternatively, Plaintiffs are willing to first address these issues with Special Master LaPorte, who has not yet had a chance to consider or weigh in on Google's objections to these many exhibits. As explained below, Google's motion improperly seeks exclusion by mischaracterizing these exhibits.

## II. ARGUMENT

### A. Exhibits Google Wrongly Claims Relate Only to Other Products

Google lumps together 87 exhibits and then falsely claims that Plaintiffs "plan to mislead the jury" by relying on documents that "do not relate to the[] [at-issue] browsers or signed-out users *at all*." Mot. at 2 (emphasis added). Many of these exhibits are highly relevant, relating directly to the at-issue private browsing modes (including Chrome Incognito) and practices.

- Exhibit 27: Email to Google's "*chrome-team*" listserv proposing to "fix the real problems" like "publishing exactly what data we normally collect (which we do NOT sufficiently do)".
- Exhibit 38: Google document addressing desire to [REDACTED]
- Exhibit 54: Google presentation addressing how Google "strive[s] for" personalized advertising "*throughout the Google system*," with Google "*leaving users no choice but to give up privacy* in order to use the Internet."
- Exhibit 89: Google document titled "*Chrome Privacy Feature Roadmap*" that discusses "a simpler way to explain Incognito," including for "*Chrome Incognito*."
- Exhibit 98: Google email addressing a "[REDACTED]"
- Exhibit 118: Google document where employees express concerns about users' "lack of understanding to what is happening with all the data that is collected about you."
- Exhibits 322 & 780: Exhibit 322 explains how Google has "a system for uniquely identifying non-logged in users (browsers) using HTTP Cookies." That identifier is linked with other identifiers Google stores with data collected from non-Google websites as well as Google websites, meaning all that data is linked. *See also* Hochman Rep. § VIII.F.
- Exhibits 541 and 771 are technical documents and presentations relating in part to display ads, which are ads shown on non-Google websites.

- Exhibits 454, 455, 876: These exhibits do not exclusively discuss “non-Browser mobile apps.” Ex. 474 discusses “Incognito session[s]” and how “cookies” are accumulated *within Chrome*, including with an image of a Chrome cookie jar. Ex. 455 compares aspects of “Chrome” Incognito with other Incognito products. Ex. 876 discusses “*Chrome Incognito*.”

In any event, these exhibits would be relevant even if they only concerned Incognito for other Google products (which is not the case). Any “inflammatory quotes” (Google’s words, Mot. at 3) speak to employees’ efforts to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Ex. 1, CABR-04195517. To the extent Google employees express frustration with Incognito in the context of other Google products, that is a consequence of Google expanding the Incognito brand rather than fixing the problems that originated in Chrome Incognito. *See also Exhibit 885* (addressing how the Incognito mode for the Google Search App “will adopt the same privacy requirements ss Chrome”). Google’s cases are also far afield.<sup>1</sup>

#### **B. Documents Google Wrongly Claims Are Only Relevant to Other Proceedings**

Google seeks to exclude three exhibits it claims relate only to “Google’s compliance with foreign regulations” and “unrelated domestic litigation.” Mot. at 1. This characterization is incorrect. Exhibit 61 is not about Google’s compliance with any law or proceeding. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] For similar reasons, this Court has already denied Google’s motion “to exclude [Plaintiffs’ privacy expert’s] opinions about hypothetical risks,” crediting Plaintiffs’ argument that “such opinions about the potential risks of data retention are relevant to the offensiveness of Google’s conduct.” Dkt. 803 at 20.

Google’s criticism of Exhibit 708 is misplaced because Plaintiffs only included that exhibit since their damages expert relied on it for discrete inputs concerning when non-Chrome browsers

<sup>1</sup> *Pom Wonderful LLC v. Tropicana Prod., Inc.*, 2010 WL 11519185, at \*5 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2010) (excluding evidence about product that “was discontinued”); *Kirola v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 2010 WL 3476681, at \*12 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2010) (granting “unopposed” motion to exclude evidence relating to matters that were specifically stricken from the class definitions at the certification stage).

rolled out certain features. Finally, the 2010 FTC Consent Decree—cited in the Complaint, Dkt. 886 ¶¶ 24-28—is relevant because it requires that Google “not misrepresent” “the purposes for which it collects and uses” information that Google “collects from or about an individual” as well as the “extent to which consumers may exercise control” over Google’s “collection” and “use” of that information. Google’s violation of the FTC Consent Decree (through the very practices at issue in this case) is relevant (at a minimum) because it triggers the “criminal or tortious act” exception to any consent defense for the ECPA claim. *See In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*, 2016 WL 3029783, at \*33 (N.D. Cal. May 27, 2016) (Koh, J.) (addressing a UCL claim predicated on a FTCA violation); 18 U.S.C. § 2511(2)(d). Finally, Exhibit 380 concerns issues regarding consent for Google Ad Manager. Google’s cases are far afield.<sup>2</sup>

### C. Documents Addressing Google’s Refusal to Improve Incognito

Google improperly seeks to exclude [REDACTED] documents concerning employees’ proposals to [REDACTED]. Google’s brief discusses just two:

Exhibit 21: This is an email from Google’s Chief Marketing Officer Lorraine Twohill to Google’s CEO Sundar Pichai, which addresses Chrome Incognito, with Ms. Twohill stressing the need to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Plaintiffs featured this document in the briefing over Ms. Twohill’s deposition (Dkt. 412-2), and this Court granted Plaintiffs’ request for that deposition, affirming the Magistrate Judge’s Order because “Ms. Twohill has unique, personal knowledge of relevant issues.” Dkt. 523 at 2.

Exhibit 425: This document concerns Google’s proposal for [REDACTED] which would [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Other exhibits Google seeks

<sup>2</sup> In *United States v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.*, 178 F. Supp. 3d 927, 948 (N.D. Cal. 2016), a party sought to admit an agency’s findings concerning a topic that was “not at issue in this case.” Plaintiffs here do such thing. The court in *Buonanoma v. Sierra Pac. Power Co.*, 2010 WL 3724254, at \*5 (D. Nev. Sept. 16, 2010)—an employment discrimination case—excluded “evidence of other lawsuits” against the defendant-employer filed by other employees. And *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.*, 2016 WL 7803893, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 15, 2016) concerned a “press release” issued by a foreign trade commission—a far cry from any of the evidence at issue here.

to strike (but does not discuss) are Exhibit 55, an email titled “The Incognito Problem” that discusses employees’ desire to [REDACTED]; and Exhibit 68, an email about plans for a presentation to CEO Sundar Pichai about [REDACTED]

These documents are all highly relevant in terms of proving liability and also for injunctive relief. Google claims the documents are relevant only if Google “somehow violated a duty owed to Plaintiffs by electing not to move forward with these features” (Mot. 3), but that is incorrect. Google’s failure to implement enhancements advocated by employees (so that Google would no longer “deceive” people, as one employee wrote) are relevant to multiple elements of Plaintiffs’ claims, including for proving breach of contract<sup>3</sup> as well as the offensiveness of Google’s conduct. The documents also undermine Google’s consent defense by proving that Google’s own employees believed the company should do more to prevent Google tracking within private browsing mode. These documents are relevant to injunctive relief as well. In these documents, employees discussed the types of changes this Court will be considering for its order.

These documents will not require “fact-intensive mini trials.” Mot. at 4. Google offers no support for that conclusory assertion. Google’s argument is particularly weak because it has never contended that it would be technically infeasible to make the kinds of privacy-enhancing changes described in these documents. *See* Ex. 2, Resp. to Rog 29 (“Google has not contended in this case that it is impossible to redesign Chrome Incognito to prevent the Chrome browser from sending information to Google . . .”). If Google has other excuses for refusing to improve Incognito, it can make its case to the jury. But the real reason, as memorialized within Google documents, is that employees were told to [REDACTED] Ex. 3, BRWN-00169228 at -28. [REDACTED] *Id.*

<sup>3</sup> *Hernandez v. Wells Fargo & Co.*, 2019 WL 3017657, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. July 10, 2019) is distinguishable because (1) it did not concern a motion *in limine*, and (2) the theory of the case was alter-ego liability in a parent-sub relationship, where there were no allegations the parent “controlled” the sub, and the court in turn held the parent did not owe duties to the plaintiffs. *Waymo LLC v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 2018 WL 646701, at \*22 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2018) is even further afield. The portion Google cites concerned evidence about the defendant’s “privilege designations” and an allegedly improper initiative related to document preservation.

**III. CONCLUSION**

Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court deny Google's Motion *in Limine* Number 3.

Dated: October 17, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Mark Mao

Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)  
mmao@bsflp.com  
Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)  
brichardson@bsflp.com  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: (415) 293-6800  
Facsimile (415) 293-6899

David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)  
dboies@bsflp.com  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
333 Main Street  
Armonk, NY 10504  
Telephone: (914) 749-8200  
Facsimile: (914) 749-8300

James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)  
jlee@bsflp.com  
Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)  
rbaeza@bsflp.com  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
100 SE 2nd Street, Suite 2800  
Miami, FL 33131  
Telephone: (305) 539-8400  
Facsimile: (305) 539-1307

Alison L. Anderson (CA Bar No. 275334)  
alanderson@bsflp.com  
M. Logan Wright (CA Bar No. 349004)  
mwright@bsflp.com  
BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
725 S. Figueroa St., 31st Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 629-9040  
Facsimile: (213) 629-9022

Bill Carmody (pro hac vice)

1 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
Shawn J. Rabin (pro hac vice)  
2 srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
Steven Shepard (pro hac vice)  
3 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
Alexander P. Frawley (pro hac vice)  
4 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  
SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
5 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 32nd Floor  
6 New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 336-8330  
7 Facsimile: (212) 336-8340

8 Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)  
abonn@susmangodfrey.com  
9 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
10 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
11 Telephone: (310) 789-3100  
12 Facsimile: (310) 789-3150

13 John A. Yanchunis (pro hac vice)  
jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
14 Ryan J. McGee (pro hac vice)  
rmcgee@forthepeople.com  
15 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.  
201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
16 Tampa, FL 33602  
Telephone: (813) 223-5505  
17 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736

18 Michael F. Ram (CA Bar No. 238027)  
mram@forthepeople.com  
19 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.  
711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500  
20 San Francisco, CA 94102  
Telephone: (415) 358-6913  
21 Facsimile: (415) 358-6923

22  
23 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28